

188 Beaumont Street Fast-track

Auckland Council Specialist Memo

Annexure 11:

Development Engineering

Inthan Azoor

27 July 2026

1.0 APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

Application and property details

Fast-Track project name: 188 Beaumont Street

Fast-Track application number: FTAA-2604-1205
BUN60464683

2.0 Technical Specialist Memo – Development Engineering

To: Lewis So – Lead Planner
Russell Butchers – Principal Project Lead

From: Inthan Azoor – Senior Development Engineer

Qualifications & Relevant Experience: I hold the qualification(s) of Bachelor of Engineering degree and PG diploma in Environmental Engineering Management and have 45 years of experience in the field of Engineering. I am a member of IPENZ (MEngNZ). I have prepared expert evidence and technical assessments for resource consent applications, plan changes, notices of requirement for designation and fast-track applications, and have appeared as an expert witness before consent authorities and the Environment Court on multiple/few occasions.

Preparation in Accordance with the Code of Conduct: I confirm that I have read the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 – Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses ([Code](#)), and have complied with it in the preparation of this memorandum. I also agree to follow the Code when participating in any subsequent processes, such as expert conferencing, directed by the Panel. I confirm that the opinions I have expressed are within my area of expertise and are my own, except where I have stated that I am relying on the work or evidence of others, which I have specified.

Signature:



Date: 27 July 2026

3.0 Specialist Assessment

3.1 Development Engineering has reviewed the application documentation and the specialist assessments prepared for stormwater, flooding, coastal hazard, water supply, wastewater, transport and geotechnical matters.

3.2 The application has been subject to specialist review by:

- Healthy Waters and Flood Resilience (stormwater and flooding);
- Watercare Services Limited (water supply and wastewater servicing);
- Auckland Transport (transport and access effects and coastal inundation risk); and
- Soil & Rock Consultants (geotechnical matters).

3.3 The specialist reviewers generally support the proposal subject to their recommended conditions and mitigation measures. No specialist reviewer has identified engineering constraints that would preclude approval of the development.

3.4 Development Engineering has not undertaken a separate technical reassessment of matters already addressed by the specialist reviewers. Instead, Development Engineering relies on the conclusions and recommended conditions contained within those specialist assessments.

3.5 The key conclusions arising from those specialist reviews are:

- Healthy Waters and Flood Resilience do not object to the application and consider that sufficient information has been provided regarding stormwater servicing and rainfall-induced flooding effects.
- Watercare considers that the proposal can be serviced by the existing water supply and wastewater networks, subject to confirmation of downstream wastewater capacity and implementation of Watercare's recommended conditions.
- Auckland Transport identifies a number of transport mitigation measures that should be incorporated into the consent framework and does not identify any matter that would preclude development of the site. However, Auckland Transport has identified an outstanding information gap regarding the proposed reliance on a safe refuge approach under Plan Change 120 (PC120) as the long-term response to coastal inundation risk.
- Soil & Rock Consultants conclude that the proposal is acceptable from a geotechnical perspective subject to further investigation, detailed design and construction-stage verification secured through conditions.

3.6 Development Engineering's assessment is limited primarily to earthworks and construction management matters. All other engineering disciplines have been addressed through separate specialist reviews and Development Engineering relies on those assessments and recommended conditions.

3.7 The proposal includes substantial excavation and earthworks associated with the construction of building foundations, basement levels, underground infrastructure and associated site works. The application indicates earthworks over an area of approximately 5,110m², including both cut and fill activities. The proposed works form an integral component of the overall redevelopment of the site.

3.8 Geotechnical and groundwater-related effects associated with the earthworks have been separately assessed through the geotechnical review process. Development Engineering relies on those specialist assessments and recommendations in relation to those matters.

3.9 From a Development Engineering perspective, the principal consideration is the management and coordination of construction activities to ensure that works are undertaken in a manner that protects public infrastructure and minimises adverse construction-related effects on the surrounding environment.

3.10 The applicant has provided a draft Construction Management Plan which addresses key construction management matters. Development Engineering considers that, given the scale and complexity of the proposed development, implementation of an appropriate Construction Management Plan is necessary to ensure the effective management of construction activities throughout the duration of the works.

3.11 Subject to implementation of the Construction Management Plan and compliance with the recommended construction management conditions, Development Engineering considers that earthworks and associated construction activities can be appropriately managed.

3.12 Development Engineering notes that Auckland Transport has sought further justification regarding the proposed reliance on a safe refuge approach under Plan Change 120 (PC120). While this matter does not represent an engineering constraint that would preclude development of the site, it remains a residual information gap that should be addressed to confirm the appropriateness of the proposed long-term coastal inundation risk management approach.

4.0 Documents Reviewed

The following documents have been reviewed in preparing this memorandum:

Substantive Application Documents

- 188 Beaumont Street, Auckland Central, Fast-track Approval Substantive Application dated 9 April 2026 prepared by Barker & Associates
- Appendix 4: 188 Beaumont Street – CONDITIONS OF CONSENT (26 March 2026) prepared by Barker & Associates
- Appendix 5: Architectural Drawings, Part 1 – Part 7, Revision A, dated 17 March 2026 prepared by Warren and Mahoney
- Appendix 8: Subdivision Scheme Plans – Part 1 Boundary Adjustment Revision E dated March 2026 prepared by Yeomans Survey Solutions
- Appendix 9: Civil Preliminary Design Report, 188 Beaumont Street, Westhaven Revision 5, dated 12 March 2026 prepared by Tonkin + Taylor
- Appendix 12: 188 Beaumont Street, Auckland Central, Coastal and flood hazard risk assessment Revision 9, dated 24 March 2026 prepared by Tonkin + Taylor
- Appendix 30: AUP(OP) Rules Assessment prepared by Barker & Associates
- Draft Construction Management Plan prepared by AECOM, March 2026
- Barker & Associates Section 67 Response to Council (and associated attachments), 14 July 2026

5.0 Section 67 Information Gap

5.1 At the time of writing this Memo I have identified the following information gaps:

Coastal Inundation Risk Hazard

Description of Missing Information

5.2 Auckland Transport identified an information gap regarding the management of future coastal inundation risk associated with the proposal. The Coastal and Flood Hazard Risk Assessment relied on an assumption that the surrounding road network may be raised in the future as part of a wider adaptation response to sea level rise. Auckland Transport sought clarification regarding the appropriateness of this assumption and whether the development could safely accommodate future occupants if those road upgrades do not occur. [

5.3 In response, the applicant provided additional information relying on a safe refuge approach under Plan Change 120 (PC120) once future sea level rise reaches a point where safe egress can no longer be maintained. Auckland Transport considered that response and acknowledged that PC120 enables either a safe refuge or safe egress approach to be adopted for the management of coastal inundation risk.

5.4 Notwithstanding the additional information provided, further technical justification is required regarding the appropriateness of relying on safe refuge as the primary long-term response to coastal inundation risk at this location.

Why is this information essential?

5.5 Further justification is required regarding the proposed reliance on a safe refuge approach under Plan Change 120 (PC120). While the applicant has identified safe refuge as the preferred adaptation pathway, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate why safe egress is not required to appropriately manage risk to future occupants over the lifetime of the development.

5.6 Additional assessment is required to explain how occupants would be safely accommodated during coastal inundation events, how emergency response and recovery arrangements would operate, and why reliance on safe refuge would continue to provide an acceptable level of risk mitigation in circumstances where surrounding roads are not raised in the future.

5.7 In the absence of this information, uncertainty remains regarding whether coastal inundation risks to future occupants have been appropriately managed over the anticipated life of the development, limiting the ability to undertake a fully informed assessment of the proposal's long-term resilience.

Information gap	Nature of deficiency	Decision-making impact	Risk / uncertainty created
1. Coastal Inundation Risk Hazard	The applicant has proposed a safe refuge approach under PC120 to manage future coastal inundation risk. Further justification is required to demonstrate why safe refuge is appropriate and why safe egress is not necessary for the site.	Limits the ability to determine whether long-term coastal inundation risks to future occupants have been appropriately avoided or mitigated.	Medium Risk. Uncertainty remains regarding the effectiveness of the proposed safe refuge approach if surrounding roads are not raised and coastal inundation risk increases over time.

6.0 Recommendation

6.1 Development Engineering supports the application from an engineering perspective.

6.2 Stormwater, flooding, water supply, wastewater, transport and geotechnical matters have been assessed by the relevant specialist reviewers and Development Engineering relies on those assessments and associated recommendations.

6.3 Development Engineering supports the proposal from an earthworks and construction management perspective. The applicant has provided a Construction Management Plan framework and Development Engineering considers that construction-related effects can be appropriately managed through implementation of the proposed construction management conditions.

6.4 Subject to implementation of the specialist conditions, the Construction Management Plan requirements and the obtaining of any necessary Engineering Plan Approvals and other infrastructure approvals, Development Engineering does not identify any engineering constraints that would preclude approval of the proposal.

6.5 Notwithstanding this conclusion, Development Engineering notes the outstanding information gap identified by Auckland Transport regarding the proposed reliance on a safe refuge approach under Plan Change 120 (PC120) and supports further assessment of that matter.

7.0 Proposed Conditions

7.1 Development Engineering concurs with the applicant's proposed Construction Site Management Plan conditions (Conditions 21–26) relating to the management of earthworks, construction activities and site operations.

7.2 Development Engineering supports the incorporation of conditions recommended by:

- Healthy Waters and Flood Resilience;

- Watercare Services Limited;
- Auckland Transport; and
- Soil & Rock Consultants.

8.0 Supporting Documents

Auckland Council Specialist Technical Reviews

- Healthy Waters and Flood Resilience Technical Memo dated 13 July 2026.
- Watercare Services Limited Memorandum dated 15 June 2026.
- Auckland Transport Specialist Memo dated 21 July 2026.
- Geotechnical Specialist Memorandum prepared by Mladen Sigurnjak, Soil & Rock Consultants, dated 13 July 2026.